

Higher-Dimensional Unified Theories with continuous and fuzzy coset spaces as extra dimensions^{*}

G. Manolakos¹, G. Zoupanos^{1,2}

E-mails: gmanol@central.ntua.gr, George.Zoupanos@cern.ch

¹*Physics Department, National Technical University,
Zografou Campus, GR-15780 Athens, Greece*

²*Institut für Theoretische Physik Universität
Heidelberg Philosophenweg 16, D-69120 Heidelberg*

Keywords: higher-dimensional theories, coset space dimensional reduction, fuzzy spheres, orbifold projection

Abstract

We first briefly review the Coset Space Dimensional Reduction (CSDR) programme and present the results of the best model so far, based on the $\mathcal{N} = 1$, $d = 10$, E_8 gauge theory reduced over the nearly-Kähler manifold $SU(3)/U(1) \times U(1)$. Then, we present the adjustment of the CSDR programme in the case that the extra dimensions are considered to be fuzzy coset spaces and then, the best model constructed in this framework, too, which is the trinification GUT, $SU(3)^3$.

1 Introduction

During the last decades, unification of the fundamental interactions has focused the interest of theoretical physicists. This has led to the rise of very interesting and well-established approaches. Important and appealing are the ones that elaborate extra dimensions. A consistent framework in this approach is superstring theories [1] with the Heterotic String [2] (defined in ten dimensions) being the most promising, due to the possibility that in principle could lead to experimentally testable predictions. More specifically, the compactification of the 10-dimensional spacetime and the dimensional reduction of the $E_8 \times E_8$ initial gauge theory lead to phenomenologically interesting Grand Unified theories (GUTs), containing the SM gauge group.

A few years before the development of the superstring theories, another important framework aiming at the same direction was employed, that is the dimensional reduction of higher-dimensional gauge theories. Pioneers in this field were Forgacs-Manton and Scherk-Schwartz studying the Coset Space Dimensional Reduction (CSDR) [3–5] and Scherk-Schwarz group manifold reduction [6], respectively. In both of these approaches, the higher-dimensional gauge fields are unifying the gauge and scalar fields, while the 4-dimensional theory contains the surviving components after the procedure of the dimensional reduction. Moreover, in the CSDR scheme, the inclusion of fermionic fields in the initial theory leads to Yukawa couplings in the 4-dimensional theory. Furthermore, upgrading the higher-dimensional gauge theory to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric, i.e. grouping the gauge and fermionic fields of the theory into the same vector supermultiplet, is a way to unify further the fields of the initial theory, in certain dimensions. A very remarkable achievement of the CSDR scheme is the possibility of obtaining chiral theories in four dimensions [7, 8].

The above context of the CSDR adopted some very welcome suggestions coming from the superstring theories (specifically from the Heterotic String [2]), that is the dimensions of the space-time and the gauge group of the higher-dimensional supersymmetric theory. In addition, taking into account the fact that the superstring

^{*}Based on a talk given by G.Z. as invited main speaker at the 11–th International Workshop on "Lie Theory and Its Applications in Physics" (LT-11), 15–21, June 2015, Varna, Bulgaria", to be published in Springer.

theories are consistent only in ten dimensions, the following important issues have to be addressed, (a) distinguish the extra dimensions from the four observable ones by considering an appropriate compactification of the metric and (b) determine the resulting 4-dimensional theory. Additionally, a suitable choice of the compactification manifolds could result into $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry, aiming for a chance to be led to realistic GUTs.

Aiming at the preservation of an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry after the dimensional reduction, Calabi-Yau (CY) spaces serve as suitable compact internal manifolds [9]. However, the emergence of the moduli stabilization problem, led to the study of flux compactification, in the context of which a wider class of internal spaces, called manifolds with $SU(3)$ -structure, was suggested. In this class of manifolds, a non-vanishing, globally defined spinor is admitted. This spinor is covariantly constant with respect to a connection with torsion, versus the CY case, where the spinor is constant with respect to the Levi-Civita connection. Here, we consider the nearly-Kähler manifolds, that is an interesting class of $SU(3)$ -structure manifolds [10-13]. The class of homogeneous nearly-Kähler manifolds in six dimensions consists of the non-symmetric coset spaces $G_2/SU(3)$, $Sp(4)/(SU(2) \times U(1))_{non-max}$, $SU(3)/U(1) \times U(1)$ and the group manifold $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ [13] (see also [10-12]). It is worth mentioning that 4-dimensional theories which are obtained after the dimensional reduction of a 10-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric gauge theory over non-symmetric coset spaces, contain supersymmetry breaking terms [14], [15], contrary to CY spaces.

Another very interesting framework which admits a description of physics at the Planck scale is non-commutative geometry [16] - [36]. Regularizing quantum field theories, or even better, building finite ones are the features that render it as a promising framework. On the other hand, the construction of quantum field theories on non-commutative spaces is a difficult task and, furthermore, problematic ultraviolet features have emerged [19] (see also [20] and [21]). However, non-commutative geometry is an appropriate framework to accommodate particle models with non-commutative gauge theories [22] (see also [23-25]).

It is remarkable that the two frameworks (superstring theories and non-commutative geometry) found contact, after the realization that, in M-theory and open String theory, the effective physics on D-branes can be described by a non-commutative gauge theory [26, 27], if a non-vanishing background antisymmetric field is present. Moreover, the type IIB superstring theory (and others related with type IIB with certain dualities) in its conjectured non-perturbative formulation as a matrix model [28], is a non-commutative theory. In the framework of non-commutative geometry, Seiberg and Witten [27] contributed the most with their study (map between commutative and non-commutative gauge theories) based on which notable developments [29, 30] were achieved and afterwards a non-commutative version of the SM was constructed [31]. Unfortunately, such extensions fail to solve the main problem of the SM, which is the presence of many free parameters.

A very interesting development in the framework of the non-commutative geometry is the programme in which the extra dimensions of higher-dimensional theories are considered to be non-commutative (fuzzy) [32-36]. This programme overcomes the ultraviolet/infrared problematic behaviours of theories defined in non-commutative spaces. A very welcome feature of such theories is that they are renormalizable, versus all known higher-dimensional theories. This aspect of the theory was examined from the 4-dimensional point of view too, using spontaneous symmetry breakings which mimic the results of the dimensional reduction of a higher-dimensional gauge theory with non-commutative (fuzzy) extra dimensions. In addition, another interesting feature is that in theories constructed in this programme, there is an option of choosing the initial higher-dimensional gauge theory to be abelian. Then, non-abelian gauge theories result in lower dimensions in the process of the dimensional reduction over fuzzy coset spaces. Finally, the important problem of chirality in this framework has been addressed by applying an orbifold projection on a $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM theory. After the orbifolding, the resulting theory is an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric, chiral $SU(3)^3$.

2 The coset space dimensional reduction of a D -dimensional YMD Lagrangian

An obvious and crude way to realize a dimensional reduction of a higher-dimensional gauge theory is to demand that all the fields of the theory are independent of the extra coordinates (trivial reduction) and therefore the Lagrangian is independent, too. A much more elegant way is to allow for a non-trivial dependence considering that a symmetry transformation on the fields by an element that belongs in the isometry group S of the compact

coset space $B = S/R$ formed by the extra dimensions is a gauge transformation (symmetric fields). Therefore, the a priori consideration of the Lagrangian as gauge invariant, renders it independent of the extra coordinates. The above way of getting rid of the extra dimensions is the basic concept of the CSDR scheme [3–5].

Let us now consider the action of the D –dimensional YM theory with gauge symmetry G , coupled to fermions defined on M^D with metric g^{MN}

$$A = \int d^4x d^d y \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}(F_{MN} F_{KL}) g^{MK} g^{NL} + \frac{i}{2} \bar{\psi} \Gamma^M D_M \psi \right], \quad (1)$$

where $D_M = \partial_M - \theta_M - A_M$, with $\theta_M = \frac{1}{2} \theta_{MNL} \Sigma^{NL}$ the spin connection of M^D and $F_{MN} = \partial_M A_N - \partial_N A_M - [A_M, A_N]$, where $M, N = 1 \dots D$ and A_M, ψ are D -dimensional symmetric fields. The fermions can be accommodated in any representation F of G , unless an additional symmetry, e.g. supersymmetry, is considered.

Let ξ_A^α , ($A = 1, \dots, \dim S$ and $\alpha = \dim R + 1, \dots, \dim S$ the curved index) be the Killing vectors which generate the symmetries of S/R and W_A , the gauge transformation associated with ξ_A . The following constraint equations for scalar ϕ , vector A_α and spinor ψ fields on S/R , derive from the definition of the symmetric fields, that is the S –transformations of the fields are gauge transformations

$$\delta_A \phi = \xi_A^\alpha \partial_\alpha \phi = D(W_A) \phi, \quad (2)$$

$$\delta_A A_\alpha = \xi_A^\beta \partial_\beta A_\alpha + \partial_\alpha \xi_A^\beta A_\beta = \partial_\alpha W_A - [W_A, A_\alpha], \quad (3)$$

$$\delta_A \psi = \xi_A^\alpha \partial_\alpha \psi - \frac{1}{2} G_{Abc} \Sigma^{bc} \psi = D(W_A) \psi, \quad (4)$$

where W_A depend only on internal coordinates y and $D(W_A)$ represents a gauge transformation in the corresponding representation where the fields belong. Solving the above constraints (2)–(4), we result with [3, 4] the unconstrained 4–dimensional fields, as well as with the remaining 4–dimensional gauge symmetry.

We proceed by analysing the constraints on the fields in the theory. We start with the gauge field A_M on M_D , which splits into its components as (A_μ, A_α) corresponding to M^4 and S/R , respectively. Solving the corresponding constraint, (3), we obtain the following information: First, the 4–dimensional gauge field, A_μ is completely independent of the coset space coordinates and second, the 4–dimensional gauge fields commute with the generators of the subgroup R in G . This means that the surviving gauge symmetry, H , is the subgroup of G that commutes with R , that is the centralizer of R in G , i.e. $H = C_G(R_G)$. The $A_\alpha(x, y) \equiv \phi_\alpha(x, y)$, transform as scalars in the 4–dimensional theory and $\phi_\alpha(x, y)$ act as intertwining operators connecting induced representations of R acting on G and S/R . In order to find the representation in which the scalars are accommodated in the 4–dimensional theory, we have to decompose G according to the embedding

$$G \supset R_G \times H, \quad \text{adj } G = (\text{adj } R, 1) + (1, \text{adj } H) + \sum (r_i, h_i), \quad (5)$$

and S under R

$$S \supset R, \quad \text{adj } S = \text{adj } R + \sum s_i. \quad (6)$$

Therefore, we conclude that for every pair r_i, s_i , where r_i and s_i are identical irreducible representations of R , there remains a scalar (Higgs) multiplet which transforms under the representation h_i of H . All other scalar fields vanish.

As far as the spinors are concerned [4, 7, 8, 41], the analysis of the corresponding constraint, (4), is quite similar. Again, solving the constraint, one finds that the spinors in the 4–dimensional theory are independent of the coset coordinates and act as intertwining operators connecting induced representations of R in $SO(d)$ and in G . In order to obtain the representation of H , where the fermions are accommodated in the resulting 4–dimensional theory, one has to decompose the initial representation F of G under the $R_G \times H$,

$$G \supset R_G \times H, \quad F = \sum (r_i, h_i), \quad (7)$$

and the spinor of $SO(d)$ under R

$$SO(d) \supset R, \quad \sigma_d = \sum \sigma_j. \quad (8)$$

Therefore, for each pair r_i and σ_i , where r_i and σ_i are identical irreducible representations, there exists a multiplet, h_i of spinor fields in the 4-dimensional theory. As for the chirality of the surviving fermions, if one begins with Dirac fermions in the higher-dimensional theory it is impossible to result with chiral fermions in the 4-dimensional theory. Further requirements have to be imposed in order to result with chiral fermions in the 4-dimensional theory. Indeed, imposing the Weyl condition in the chiral representations of an even higher-dimensional initial theory, one is led to a chiral theory in four dimensions. This is not the case in an odd higher-dimensional initial theory, in which Weyl condition cannot be imposed. The most interesting case is the $D = 2n + 2$ even higher dimensional initial theory, in which starting with fermions in the adjoint representation the Weyl condition leads to two sets of chiral fermions with the same quantum numbers under H of the 4-dimensional theory. This doubling of the fermionic spectrum can be eliminated after imposing the Majorana condition. The two conditions are compatible when $D = 4n + 2$, which is the case of our interest.

Now, let us move on and determine the 4-dimensional effective action. The first and very important step is to compactify the space M^D to $M^4 \times S/R$, with S/R a compact coset space. After the compactification, the metric will be transformed to

$$g^{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^{\mu\nu} & 0 \\ 0 & -g^{ab} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where $\eta^{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$ and g^{ab} is the metric of the coset. Inserting the (9) into the initial action and taking into account the constraints of the fields, we obtain

$$A = C \int d^4x \left[-\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^t F^{t\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} (D_\mu \phi_\alpha)^t (D^\mu \phi^\alpha)^t + V(\phi) + \frac{i}{2} \bar{\psi} \Gamma^\mu D_\mu \psi - \frac{i}{2} \bar{\psi} \Gamma^a D_a \psi \right], \quad (10)$$

where $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - A_\mu$ and $D_a = \partial_a - \theta_a - \phi_a$, with $\theta_a = \frac{1}{2} \theta_{abc} \Sigma^{bc}$ the connection of the space and C is the volume of the space. The potential $V(\phi)$ is given by the following expression

$$V(\phi) = -\frac{1}{4} g^{ac} g^{bd} \text{Tr}(f_{ab}^C \phi_C - [\phi_a, \phi_b])(f_{cd}^D \phi_D - [\phi_c, \phi_d]), \quad (11)$$

where, $A = 1, \dots, \dim S$ and f 's are the structure constants appearing in the commutators of the Lie algebra of S . Considering the constraints of the fields, (2)-(3), one finds that the scalar fields ϕ_a have to obey the following equation:

$$f_{ai}^D \phi_D - [\phi_a, \phi_i] = 0, \quad (12)$$

where the ϕ_i are the generators of R_G . Consequently, some fields will be filtered out, while others will survive the reduction and will be identified as the genuine Higgs fields. The potential $V(\phi)$, written down in terms of the surviving scalars (the Higgs fields), is a quartic polynomial which is invariant under the 4-dimensional gauge group, H . Then, it follows the determination of the minimum of the potential and the finding of the remaining gauge symmetry of the vacuum [42–44]. In general, this is a rather difficult procedure. However, there is a case in which one could obtain the result of the spontaneous breaking of the gauge group H very easily, whether the following criterion is satisfied. Whenever S has an isomorphic image S_G in G , then the 4-dimensional gauge group H breaks spontaneously to a subgroup K , where K is the centralizer of S_G in the gauge group of the initial, higher-dimensional, theory, G [4, 42–44]. This can be illustrated in the following scheme,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G & \supset & S_G \times K \\ & \cup & \cap \\ G & \supset & R_G \times H \end{array} \quad (13)$$

In addition, the potential of the resulting 4-dimensional gauge theory is always of spontaneous symmetry breaking form, when the coset space is symmetric¹. A negative result in this case is that, after the dimensional reduction, the fermions end up being supermassive, as in the Kaluza-Klein theory.

¹A coset space is called symmetric when $f_{ab}^c = 0$

Let us now summarize a few results coming from the dimensional reduction of the $\mathcal{N} = 1, E_8$ SYM over the nearly-Kähler manifold $SU(3)/U(1) \times U(1)$. The 4-dimensional gauge group will be derived by the following decomposition of E_8 under $R = U(1) \times U(1)$

$$E_8 \supset E_6 \times SU(3) \supset E_6 \times U(1)_A \times U(1)_B. \quad (14)$$

Satisfying the above criterion, the surviving gauge group in four dimensions is

$$H = C_{E_8}(U(1)_A \times U(1)_B) = E_6 \times U(1)_A \times U(1)_B. \quad (15)$$

The surviving scalars and fermions in four dimensions are obtained by the decomposition of the adjoint representation of E_8 , that is the 248, under $U(1)_A \times U(1)_B$. Applying the CSDR rules, one obtains the resulting 4-dimensional theory, which is an $\mathcal{N} = 1, E_6$ GUT, with $U(1)_A, U(1)_B$ global symmetries. The potential is fully determined after a lengthy calculation and can be found in ref [15]. Subtracting the F - and D - terms contributing to this potential, one can determine also scalar masses and trilinear scalar terms, which can be identified with the scalar part of the soft supersymmetry breaking sector of the theory. In addition, the gaugino obtains a mass, which receives a contribution from the torsion, contrary to the rest soft supersymmetry breaking terms. The important point to note is that the CSDR leads to the soft supersymmetry breaking sector without any additional assumption.

In order to break further the E_6 GUT, one has to employ the Wilson flux mechanism. Due to the space limitation we cannot describe here the mechanism and its application in the present case. The details can be found in ref [12]. The resulting theory is a softly broken $\mathcal{N} = 1$, chiral $SU(3)^3$ theory which can break further to an extension of the MSSM.

3 Fuzzy spaces

3.1 The fuzzy sphere

In order to introduce the non-commutative space of the fuzzy sphere, we are going to begin with the familiar ordinary sphere S^2 and extend it to its fuzzy version. The S^2 may be considered as a manifold embedded into the 3-dimensional Euclidean space, $\mathbb{R}^3$. This embedding allows us to specify the algebra of the functions on S^2 through $\mathbb{R}^3$, by imposing the constraint

$$\sum_{a=1}^3 x_a^2 = R^2, \quad (16)$$

where x_a are the coordinates of $\mathbb{R}^3$ and R is the radius of S^2 . The isometry group of S^2 is a global $SO(3)$, which is generated by the three angular momentum operators, $L_a = -i\epsilon_{abc}x_b\partial_c$, due to the isomorphism $SO(3) \simeq SU(2)$.

If we write the three operators L_a in terms of the spherical coordinates θ, ϕ , the generators are expressed as $L_a = -i\xi_a^\alpha\partial_\alpha$, where the greek index, α , denotes the spherical coordinates and ξ_a^α are the components of the Killing vector fields which generate the isometries of the sphere².

The spherical harmonics, $Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$, are the eigenfunctions of the operator

$$L^2 = -R^2\Delta_{S^2} = -R^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}}\partial_a(g^{ab}\sqrt{g}\partial_b). \quad (17)$$

Acting with L^2 on $Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$, one obtains its eigenvalues,

$$L^2 Y_{lm} = l(l+1)Y_{lm}, \quad (18)$$

where l is a non-negative integer. In addition, the $Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$ obey the orthogonality condition

$$\int \sin\theta d\theta d\phi Y_{lm}^\dagger Y_{l'm'} = \delta_{ll'}\delta_{mm'}. \quad (19)$$

²The S^2 metric can be expressed in terms of the Killing vectors as $g^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{R^2}\xi_a^\alpha\xi_a^\beta$.

Since $Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$ form a complete and orthogonal set of functions, any function on S^2 can be expanded on this set

$$a(\theta, \phi) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^l a_{lm} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi), \quad (20)$$

where a_{lm} are complex coefficients. Alternatively, spherical harmonics can also be expressed in terms of the coordinates of $\mathbb{R}^3$, x_a , as

$$Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi) = \sum_{\vec{a}} f_{a_1 \dots a_l}^{lm} x^{a_1 \dots a_l}, \quad (21)$$

where $f_{a_1 \dots a_l}^{lm}$ is an l -rank (traceless) symmetric tensor.

Let us now make the extension of S^2 to its fuzzy version. Fuzzy sphere is a typical case of a non-commutative space, meaning that the algebra of functions is not commutative, as it is on S^2 , with l having an upper limit. Therefore, due to this truncation, one obtains a finite dimensional (non-commutative) algebra, in particular l^2 dimensional. Thus, it is natural to consider the truncated algebra as a matrix algebra and it is consistent to consider the fuzzy sphere as a matrix approximation of the S^2 .

According to the above, it follows that we are able to expand N -dimensional matrices on a fuzzy sphere as

$$\hat{a} = \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=-l}^l a_{lm} \hat{Y}_{lm}, \quad (22)$$

where $\hat{Y}_{lm}$ are spherical harmonics of the fuzzy sphere, which are now given by

$$\hat{Y}_{lm} = R^{-l} \sum_{\vec{a}} f_{a_1 \dots a_l}^{lm} \hat{X}^{a_1} \dots \hat{X}^{a_l}, \quad (23)$$

where

$$\hat{X}_a = \frac{2R}{\sqrt{N^2 - 1}} \lambda_a^{(N)}, \quad (24)$$

where $\lambda_a^{(N)}$ are the $SU(2)$ generators in the N -dimensional representation and $f_{a_1 \dots a_l}^{lm}$ is the same tensor that we met in (21). The $\hat{Y}_{lm}$ also satisfy the orthonormality condition

$$\text{Tr}_N \left(\hat{Y}_{lm}^\dagger \hat{Y}_{l'm'} \right) = \delta_{ll'} \delta_{mm'}. \quad (25)$$

Moreover, there is a relation between the expansion of a function, (20), and that of a matrix, (22) on the original and the fuzzy sphere, respectively

$$\hat{a} = \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=-l}^l a_{lm} \hat{Y}_{lm} \quad \rightarrow \quad a = \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=-l}^l a_{lm} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi). \quad (26)$$

The above relation is obviously a map from matrices to functions. Since we introduced the fuzzy sphere as a truncation of the algebra of functions on S^2 , considering the same a_{lm} was just the most natural choice. Of course, the choice of the map is not unique, since it is not obligatory to consider the same expansion coefficients a_{lm} . The above is a 1 : 1 mapping given by [37],

$$a(\theta, \phi) = \sum_{lm} \text{Tr}_N (\hat{Y}_{lm}^\dagger \hat{a}) Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi). \quad (27)$$

The matrix trace is mapped to an integral over the sphere:

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}_N \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{1}{4\pi} \int d\Omega. \quad (28)$$

Summing up, the fuzzy sphere is a matrix approximation of the ordinary sphere, S^2 . The truncation of the algebra of the functions results to loss of commutativity, ending up with a non-commutative algebra, that

of matrices, $\text{Mat}(N; \mathbb{C})$. Therefore, the fuzzy sphere, S_N , is the non-commutative manifold with $\hat{X}_a$ being the coordinate functions. As given by (24), $\hat{X}_a$ are $N \times N$ hermitian matrices produced by the generators of $SU(2)$ in the N -dimensional representation. Obviously they have to obey both the condition

$$\sum_{a=1}^3 \hat{X}_a \hat{X}_a = R^2, \quad (29)$$

which is the analogue of (16), and the commutation relations

$$[\hat{X}_a, \hat{X}_b] = i\alpha \epsilon_{abc} \hat{X}_c, \quad \alpha = \frac{2R}{\sqrt{N^2 - 1}}. \quad (30)$$

Equivalently, one can consider the algebra on S_N being described by the antihermitian matrices

$$X_a = \frac{\hat{X}_a}{i\alpha R}, \quad (31)$$

also satisfying the modified relations (29), (30)

$$\sum_{a=1}^3 X_a X_a = -\frac{1}{\alpha^2}, \quad [X_a, X_b] = C_{abc} X_c, \quad (32)$$

where $C_{abc} = \frac{1}{R} \epsilon_{abc}$.

Let us proceed by briefly mentioning the differential calculus on the fuzzy sphere, which is 3-dimensional and $SU(2)$ covariant. The derivations of a function f , along X_a are

$$e_a(f) = [X_a, f], \quad (33)$$

and consequently, the Lie derivative on f is

$$\mathcal{L}_a f = [X_a, f], \quad (34)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_a$ obeys the Leibniz rule and the commutation relation of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$

$$[\mathcal{L}_a, \mathcal{L}_b] = C_{abc} \mathcal{L}_c. \quad (35)$$

Working on the framework of differential forms, θ^a are the 1-forms dual to the vector fields e_a , namely $\langle e_a, \theta^b \rangle = \delta_a^b$. Therefore, the exterior derivative, d , acting on a function f , gives

$$df = [X_a, f] \theta^a, \quad (36)$$

and the action of the Lie derivative on the 1-forms θ^b gives

$$\mathcal{L}_a \theta^b = C_{abc} \theta^c. \quad (37)$$

The Lie derivative obeys the Leibniz law, therefore its action on any 1-form $\omega = \omega_a \theta^a$ gives

$$\mathcal{L}_b \omega = \mathcal{L}_b(\omega_a \theta^a) = [X_b, \omega_a] \theta^a - \omega_a C_{bc}^a \theta^c, \quad (38)$$

where we have applied (34), (37). Therefore, one obtains the result

$$(\mathcal{L}_b \omega)_a = [X_b, \omega_a] - \omega_c C_{ba}^c. \quad (39)$$

After having stated the differential geometry of fuzzy sphere, one could extend the study of the differential geometry of $M^4 \times S_N^2$, which is the product of Minkowski space and fuzzy sphere with fuzziness level $N - 1$. For example, any 1-form A of $M^4 \times S_N^2$ can be expressed in terms of M^4 and S_N^2 , that is

$$A = A_\mu dx^\mu + A_a \theta^a, \quad (40)$$

where A_μ, A_a depend on both x^μ and X_a coordinates.

Furthermore, instead of functions on the fuzzy sphere, one can examine the case of spinors [32]. Moreover, although we do not include them in the present review, studies of the differential geometry of other higher-dimensional fuzzy spaces (e.g. fuzzy CP^M) have been done [32].

3.2 Gauge theory on the fuzzy sphere

Let us consider a field $\phi(X_a)$ on the fuzzy sphere, depending on the powers of the coordinates, X_a . The infinitesimal transformation of $\phi(X_a)$ is

$$\delta\phi(X) = \lambda(X)\phi(X), \quad (41)$$

where $\lambda(X)$ is the parameter of the gauge transformation. If $\lambda(X)$ is an antihermitian function of X_a , the (41) is an infinitesimal (abelian) $U(1)$ transformation. On the other hand, if $\lambda(X)$ is valued in $\text{Lie}(U(P))$, that is the algebra of $P \times P$ hermitian matrices, then the (41) is infinitesimal (non-abelian), $U(P)$. Naturally, it holds that $\delta X_a = 0$, which ensures the invariance of the covariant derivatives under a gauge transformation. Therefore, in the non-commutative case, left multiplication by a coordinate is not a covariant operation, that is

$$\delta(X_a\phi) = X_a\lambda(X)\phi, \quad (42)$$

and in general it holds that

$$X_a\lambda(X)\phi \neq \lambda(X)X_a\phi. \quad (43)$$

Motivated by the non-fuzzy gauge theory, one may introduce the covariant coordinates ϕ_a , such that

$$\delta(\phi_a\phi) = \lambda\phi_a\phi, \quad (44)$$

which holds if

$$\delta(\phi_a) = [\lambda, \phi_a]. \quad (45)$$

Usual (non-fuzzy) gauge theory also guides one to define

$$\phi_a \equiv X_a + A_a, \quad (46)$$

with the A_a being interpreted as the gauge potential of the non-commutative theory. Therefore, the covariant coordinates ϕ_a are the non-commutative analogue of the covariant derivative of ordinary gauge theories. From (46), (45) one is led to the transformation of A_a , that is

$$\delta A_a = -[X_a, \lambda] + [\lambda, A_a], \quad (47)$$

a form that encourages the interpretation of A_a as a gauge field. In correspondence with the non-fuzzy gauge theory, one proceeds with defining a field strength tensor, F_{ab} , as

$$F_{ab} \equiv [X_a, A_b] - [X_b, A_a] + [A_a, A_b] - C_{ab}^c A_c = [\phi_a, \phi_b] - C_{ab}^c \phi_c \quad (48)$$

It can be proven that the transformation of the above field strength tensor is covariant:

$$\delta F_{ab} = [\lambda, F_{ab}]. \quad (49)$$

4 Ordinary fuzzy dimensional reduction and gauge symmetry enhancement

Let us now proceed by performing a simple (trivial) dimensional reduction in order to demonstrate the structure we sketched in the previous section. Starting with a higher-dimensional theory on $M^4 \times (S/R)_F$, with gauge group $G = U(P)$, we determine the produced 4-dimensional theory after performing the reduction and finally we make comments on the results. Let $(S/R)_F$ be a fuzzy coset, e.g. the fuzzy sphere, S_N^2 . The action is

$$S_{YM} = \frac{1}{4g^2} \int d^4x k \text{Tr}_G F_{MN} F^{MN}, \quad (50)$$

with tr_G the trace of the gauge group G and $k\text{Tr}^3$ denotes the integration over $(S/R)_F$, i.e. the fuzzy coset which is described by $N \times N$ matrices. F_{MN} is the higher-dimensional field strength tensor, which is composed of

³In general, k is a parameter related to the size of the fuzzy coset space. In the case of the fuzzy sphere, k is related to the radius of the sphere and the integer l .

both 4-dimensional spacetime and extra-dimensional parts, i.e. $(F_{\mu\nu}, F_{\mu a}, F_{ab})$. The components of F_{MN} in the extra (non-commutative) directions, are expressed in terms of the covariant coordinates ϕ_a , as follows

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mu a} &= \partial_\mu \phi_a + [A_\mu, \phi_a] = D_\mu \phi_a \\ F_{ab} &= [X_a, A_b] - [X_b, A_a] + [A_a, A_b] - C_{ba}^c A_{ac} . \end{aligned}$$

Putting the above equations in (50), the action takes the form

$$\mathcal{S}_{YM} = \int d^4x \text{Trtr}_G \left(\frac{k}{4g^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{k}{2g^2} (D_\mu \phi_a)^2 - V(\phi) \right) , \quad (51)$$

where $V(\phi)$ denotes the potential, derived from the kinetic term of F_{ab} , that is

$$\begin{aligned} V(\phi) &= -\frac{k}{4g^2} \text{Trtr}_G \sum_{ab} F_{ab} F_{ab} \\ &= -\frac{k}{4g^2} \text{Trtr}_G ([\phi_a, \phi_b][\phi^a, \phi^b] - 4C_{abc} \phi^a \phi^b \phi^c + 2R^{-2} \phi^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

It is natural to consider (51) as an action of a 4-dimensional theory. Let $\lambda(x^\mu, X^a)$ be the gauge parameter that appears in an infinitesimal gauge transformation of G . This transformation can be interpreted as a M^4 gauge transformation. We write

$$\lambda(x^\mu, X^a) = \lambda^I(x^\mu, X^a) \mathcal{T}^I = \lambda^{h,I}(x^\mu) \mathcal{T}^h \mathcal{T}^I , \quad (53)$$

where $\mathcal{T}^I$ denote the hermitian generators of the gauge group $U(P)$. $\lambda^I(x^\mu, X^a)$ are the $N \times N$ antihermitian matrices, therefore they can be expressed as $\lambda^{I,h}(x^\mu) \mathcal{T}^h$, where $\mathcal{T}^h$ are the antihermitian generators of $U(N)$ and $\lambda^{I,h}(x^\mu)$, $h = 1, \dots, N^2$, are the Kaluza-Klein modes of $\lambda^I(x^\mu, X^a)$. In turn, we can assume that the fields on the right hand side of (53) could be considered as one field that takes values in the tensor product Lie algebra $\text{Lie}(U(N)) \otimes \text{Lie}(U(P))$, which corresponds to the algebra $\text{Lie}(U(NP))$. Similarly, the gauge field A_ν can be written as

$$A_\nu(x^\mu, X^a) = A_\nu^I(x^\mu, X^a) \mathcal{T}^I = A_\nu^{h,I}(x^\mu) \mathcal{T}^h \mathcal{T}^I , \quad (54)$$

which is interpreted as a gauge field on M^4 that takes values in the $\text{Lie}(U(NP))$ algebra. A similar consideration can also be applied in the case of scalar fields ⁴.

It is worth noting the enhancement of the gauge symmetry of the 4-dimensional theory compared to the gauge symmetry of the higher-dimensional theory. In other words, we can start with an abelian gauge group in higher dimensions and result with a non-abelian gauge symmetry in the 4-dimensional theory. A defect of this theory is that the scalars are accommodated in the adjoint representation of the 4-dimensional gauge group, which means that they cannot induce the electroweak symmetry breaking. This motivates the realization of non-trivial dimensional reduction schemes, like the one that follows in the next section.

5 Fuzzy CSDR

In order to result with a less defective 4-dimensional gauge theory, we proceed by performing a non-trivial dimensional reduction, that is the fuzzy version of the CSDR.

So, in this section we adopt the CSDR programme in the non-commutative framework, where the extra dimensions are fuzzy coset spaces [32]⁵, in order to result with a smaller number of both gauge and scalar fields in the 4-dimensional action (51). In general, the group S acts on the fuzzy coset $(S/R)_F$, and in accordance with the commutative case, CSDR scheme suggests that the fields of the theory must be invariant under an infinitesimal group S -transformation, up to an infinitesimal gauge transformation. Specifically, the fuzzy coset

⁴Also, Trtr_G is interpreted as the trace of the $U(NP)$ matrices.

⁵See also [47].

in this case is the fuzzy sphere, $(SU(2)/U(1))_F$, so the action of an infinitesimal $SU(2)$ –transformation should leave the scalar and gauge fields invariant, up to an infinitesimal gauge transformation

$$\mathcal{L}_b \phi = \delta_{W_b} \phi = W_b \phi \quad (55)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_b A = \delta_{W_b} A = -DW_b, \quad (56)$$

where A is the gauge potential expressed as an 1–form, see (40), and W_b is an antihermitian gauge parameter depending only on the coset coordinates X^a . Therefore, W_b is written as

$$W_b = W_b^I \mathcal{T}^I, \quad I = 1, 2, \dots, P^2, \quad (57)$$

where $\mathcal{T}^I$ are the hermitian generators of $U(P)$ and $(W_b^I)^\dagger = -W_b^I$, where the † denotes the hermitian conjugation on the X^a coordinates.

Putting into use the covariant coordinates, ϕ_a , (46), and ω_a , defined as

$$\omega_a \equiv X_a - W_a, \quad (58)$$

the CSDR constraints, (55), (56), convert to

$$[\omega_b, A_\mu] = 0 \quad (59)$$

$$C_{bde} \phi^e = [\omega_b, \phi_d]. \quad (60)$$

Due to the fact that Lie derivatives respect the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ commutation relation, (35), one results with the following consistency condition

$$[\omega_a, \omega_b] = C_{ab}^c \omega_c, \quad (61)$$

where the transformation of ω_a is given by

$$\omega_a \rightarrow \omega'_a = g \omega_a g^{-1}. \quad (62)$$

In the case of spinor fields, the procedure is quite similar [32].

Let us now consider a higher-dimensional theory with gauge symmetry $G = U(1)$. We are going to perform a fuzzy CSDR, in which the fuzzy sphere is $(S/R)_F = S_N^2$. The $\omega_a = \omega_a(X^b)$ are $N \times N$ antihermitian matrices, therefore they can be considered as elements of $\text{Lie}(U(N))$. At the same time, they satisfy the commutation relation of $\text{Lie}(SU(2))$, as in the consistency condition, (61). So we have to embed $\text{Lie}(SU(2))$ into $\text{Lie}(U(N))$. Therefore, if $\mathcal{T}^h$, $h = 1, \dots, N^2$ are the $\text{Lie}(U(N))$ generators, in the fundamental representation, then the convention $h = (a, u)$, $a = 1, 2, 3$, $u = 4, 5, \dots, N^2$ can be used, obviously with the generators T^a satisfying $\text{Lie}(SU(2))$

$$[T^a, T^b] = C_c^{ab} T^c. \quad (63)$$

At last, the embedding is defined by the identification

$$\omega_a = T_a. \quad (64)$$

So, the constraint (59) implies that the gauge group of the 4–dimensional theory, K , is the centralizer of the image of $SU(2)$ into $U(N)$, that is

$$K = C_{U(N)}(SU(2)) = SU(N-2) \times U(1) \times U(1), \quad (65)$$

where the second $U(1)$ in the right hand side is present due to

$$U(N) \simeq SU(N) \times U(1). \quad (66)$$

Therefore, $A_\mu(x, X)$ are arbitrary functions over x , but they depend on X in a way that take values in $\text{Lie}(K)$ instead of $\text{Lie}(U(N))$. That means that we result with a 4–dimensional gauge potential which takes values in $\text{Lie}(K)$.

Let us now study the next constraint, (60). This one gets satisfied choosing

$$\phi_a = r\phi(x)\omega_a, \quad (67)$$

meaning that the degrees of freedom remaining unconstrained are related to the scalar field, $\phi(x)$, which is singlet under the 4-dimensional gauge group, K .

Summing up the results from the above reduction, the consistency condition (61), dictated the embedding of $SU(2)$ into $U(N)$. Although the embedding was realized into the fundamental representation of $U(N)$, we could have used the irreducible N -dimensional representation of $SU(2)$ by identifying $\omega_a = X_a$. If so, the constraint (59) would lead to the $U(1)$ to be the 4-dimensional gauge group, with $A_\mu(x)$ getting values in $U(1)$. The second constraint, (60), implies that, in this case too, $\phi(x)$ is a scalar singlet.

To conclude the whole procedure, one starts with a $U(1)$ higher-dimensional gauge theory on $M^4 \times S_N^2$ and because of the consistency condition, (61), an embedding of $SU(2)$ into $U(N)$ is required⁶. So, the first fuzzy CSDR constraint, (59), gives the 4-dimensional gauge group and from the second one, (60), one obtains the 4-dimensional scalar fields, surviving from the dimensional reduction.

As far as the fermions are concerned, we briefly mention the results of the above dimensional reduction. According to the extended analysis [32], it is proven that the appropriate choice of embedding is

$$S \subset SO(\dim S), \quad (68)$$

which is achieved by $T_a = \frac{1}{2}C_{abc}\Gamma^{bc}$, respecting (63). Therefore, ψ functions as an intertwining operator between the representations of S and $SO(\dim S)$. In accordance to the commutative (non-fuzzy) case, [4], in order to find the surviving fermions in the 4-dimensional theory, one has to decompose the adjoint representation of $U(NP)$ under the product $S_{U(NP)} \times K$, that is

$$U(NP) \supset S_{U(NP)} \times K, \quad (69)$$

$$\text{adj } U(NP) = \sum_i (s_i, k_i). \quad (70)$$

Also, the decomposition of the spinorial representation σ of $SO(\dim S)$ under S is

$$SO(\dim S) \supset S, \quad (71)$$

$$\sigma = \sum_e \sigma_e. \quad (72)$$

Thus, if the two irreducible representations s_i, σ_e are identical, the surviving fermions of the 4-dimensional theory (4-dimensional spinors) belong to the k_i representation of gauge group K .

Before we move on, this is a suitable point to compare the higher-dimensional theory $M^4 \times (S/R)$, to its fuzzy extension, $M^4 \times (S/R)_F$. The first similarity has to do with the fact that fuzziness does not affect the isometries, both spaces have the same, $SO(1, 3) \times SO(3)$. The second is that the gauge couplings defined on both spaces have the same dimensionality. But, on the other hand, a very striking difference is that of the two, only the non-commutative higher-dimensional theory is renormalizable⁷. In addition, a $U(1)$ initial gauge symmetry on $M^4 \times (S/R)_F$, is enough in order to result with non-abelian structures in four dimensions⁸.

6 Orbifolds and fuzzy extra dimensions

The introduction of the orbifold structure (similar to the one developed in [48]) in the framework of gauge theories with fuzzy extra dimensions was motivated by the necessity of chiral low energy theories. In order to justify further the renormalizability of the theories constructed so far using fuzzy extra dimensions, we were

⁶This embedding is achieved non-uniquely, specifically in p_N ways, where p_N is the possible ways one can partition the N into a set of non-increasing, positive integers [40].

⁷The number of counter-terms required to eliminate the divergencies is finite.

⁸Technically, this is possible because $N \times N$ matrices can be decomposed on the $U(N)$ generators.

led to consider the reverse procedure and start from a renormalizable theory in four dimensions and try to reproduce the results of a higher-dimensional theory reduced over fuzzy coset spaces [33–35]. This idea was realized as follows: one starts with a 4-dimensional gauge theory including appropriate scalar fields and a suitable potential leading to vacua that could be interpreted as dynamically generated fuzzy extra dimensions, including a finite Kaluza-Klein tower of massive modes. This reverse procedure gives hope that an initial abelian gauge theory does not have to be higher-dimensional and the non-abelian gauge theory structure could emerge from fluctuations of the coordinates [55]. The whole idea eventually seems to have similarities to the idea of dimensional deconstruction introduced earlier [70].

The inclusion of fermions in such models was desired too, but the best one could achieve for some time contained mirror fermions in bifundamental representations of the low-energy gauge group [34, 35]. Mirror fermions do not exclude the possibility to make contact with phenomenology [72], nevertheless, it is preferred to result with exactly chiral fermions.

Next, the plan that was sketched above is realized. Specifically, we are going to deal with the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ orbifold projection of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Supersymmetric Yang Mills (SYM) theory [58], examining the action of the discrete group on the fields of the theory and the superpotential that emerges in the projected theory.

6.1 $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM field theory and $\mathbb{Z}_3$ orbifolds

So, let us begin with an $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric $SU(3N)$ gauge theory defined on the Minkowski spacetime. The particle spectrum of the theory (in the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ terminology) consists of an $SU(3N)$ gauge supermultiplet and three adjoint chiral supermultiplets $\Phi^i, i = 1, 2, 3$. The component fields of the above supermultiplets are the gauge bosons, $A_\mu, \mu = 1, \dots, 4$, six adjoint real (or three complex) scalars $\phi^a, a = 1, \dots, 6$ and four adjoint Weyl fermions $\psi^p, p = 1, \dots, 4$. The scalars and Weyl fermions transform according to the 6 and 4 representations of the $SU(4)_R$ R -symmetry of the theory, respectively, while the gauge bosons are singlets.

Then, in order to introduce orbifolds, the discrete group $\mathbb{Z}_3$ has to be considered as a subgroup of $SU(4)_R$. The choice of the embedding of $\mathbb{Z}_3$ into $SU(4)_R$ is not unique and the options are not equivalent, since the choice of embedding affects the amount of the remnant supersymmetry [48]:

- Maximal embedding of $\mathbb{Z}_3$ into $SU(4)_R$ is excluded because it would lead to non-supersymmetric models,
- Embedding of $\mathbb{Z}_3$ in an $SU(4)_R$ subgroup:
 - Embedding into an $SU(2)$ subgroup would lead to $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric models with $SU(2)_R$ R -symmetry
 - Embedding into an $SU(3)$ subgroup would lead to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric models with $U(1)_R$ R -symmetry.

We focus on the last embedding which is the desired one, since it leads to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric models. Let us consider a generator $g \in \mathbb{Z}_3$, labeled (for convenience) by three integers $\vec{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$ [53] satisfying the relation

$$a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = 0 \pmod{3}. \quad (73)$$

The last equation implies that $\mathbb{Z}_3$ is embedded in the $SU(3)$ subgroup, i.e. the remnant supersymmetry is the desired $\mathcal{N} = 1$ [56].

It is expected that since the various fields of the theory transform differently under $SU(4)_R$, $\mathbb{Z}_3$ will act non-trivially on them. Gauge and gaugino fields are singlets under $SU(4)_R$, therefore the geometric action of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ rotation is trivial. The action of $\mathbb{Z}_3$ on the complex scalar fields is given by the matrix $\gamma(g)_{ij} = \delta_{ij}\omega^{a_i}$, where $\omega = e^{\frac{2\pi}{3}}$ and the action of $\mathbb{Z}_3$ on the fermions ϕ^i is given by $\gamma(g)_{ij} = \delta_{ij}\omega^{b_i}$, where $b_i = -\frac{1}{2}(a_{i+1} + a_{i+2} - a_i)^9$. In the case under study the three integers of the generator g are $(1, 1, -2)$, meaning that $a_i = b_i$.

⁹Also modulo 3

The matter fields are not invariant under a gauge transformation, therefore $\mathbb{Z}_3$ acts on their gauge indices, too. The action of this rotation is given by the matrix

$$\gamma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_N & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega \mathbf{1}_N & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^2 \mathbf{1}_N \end{pmatrix}. \quad (74)$$

There is no specific reason for these blocks to have the same dimensionality (see e.g. [59–61]). However, since the projected theory must be free of anomalies, the dimension of the three blocks is the same.

After the orbifold projection, the spectrum of the theory consists of the fields that are invariant under the combined action of the discrete group, $\mathbb{Z}_3$, on the "geometric"¹⁰ and gauge indices [53]. As far as the gauge bosons are concerned being singlets, the projection is $A_\mu = \gamma_3 A_\mu \gamma_3^{-1}$. Therefore, taking into consideration (74), the gauge group of the initial theory breaks down to the group $H = SU(N) \times SU(N) \times SU(N)$ in the projected theory.

As we have already stated, the complex scalar fields transform non-trivially under the gauge and R -symmetry, so the projection is $\phi_{IJ}^i = \omega^{I-J+a_i} \phi_{IJ}^i$, where I, J are gauge indices. Therefore, $J = I + a_i$, meaning that the scalar fields surviving the orbifold projection have the form $\phi_{I, I+a_i}$ and transform under the gauge group H as

$$3 \cdot ((N, \bar{N}, 1) + (\bar{N}, 1, N) + (1, N, \bar{N})) . \quad (75)$$

Similarly, fermions transform non-trivially under the gauge group and R -symmetry, too with the projection being $\psi_{IJ}^i = \omega^{I-J+b_i} \psi_{IJ}^i$. Therefore, the fermions surviving the projection have the form $\psi_{I, I+b_i}^i$ accommodated in the same representation of H as the scalars, that is (75), a fact demonstrating the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ remnant supersymmetry. It is worth noting that the representations (75) of the resulting theory are anomaly free.

The fermions, summing up the above results, are accommodated into chiral representations of H and there are three fermionic generations since, as we have mentioned above, the particle spectrum contains three $\mathcal{N} = 1$ chiral supermultiplets.

The interactions of the projected model are given by the superpotential. In order to specify it, one has to begin with the superpotential of the initial $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM theory [58]

$$W_{\mathcal{N}=4} = \epsilon_{ijk} \text{Tr}(\Phi^i \Phi^j \Phi^k), \quad (76)$$

where, Φ^i, Φ^j, Φ^k are the three chiral superfields of the theory. After the projection, the structure of the superpotential remains unchanged, but it encrypts only the interactions among the surviving fields of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theory, that is

$$W_{\mathcal{N}=1}^{(proj)} = \sum_I \epsilon_{ijk} \Phi_{I, I+a_i}^i \Phi_{I+a_i, I+a_i+a_j}^j \Phi_{I+a_i+a_j, I}^k. \quad (77)$$

6.2 Dynamical generation of twisted fuzzy spheres

From the superpotential $W_{\mathcal{N}=1}^{proj}$ that is given in (77), the scalar potential can be extracted:

$$V_{\mathcal{N}=1}^{proj}(\phi) = \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}([\phi^i, \phi^j]^\dagger [\phi^i, \phi^j]) , \quad (78)$$

where, ϕ^i are the scalar component fields of the superfield Φ^i . The potential $V_{\mathcal{N}=1}^{proj}(\phi)$ is minimized by vanishing vevs of the fields, so modifications have to be made, in order that solutions interpreted as vacua of a non-commutative geometry to be emerged.

So, in order to result with a minimum of $V_{\mathcal{N}=1}^{proj}(\phi)$, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ soft supersymmetric terms of the form¹¹

$$V_{SSB} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i m_i^2 \phi^{i\dagger} \phi^i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k} h_{ijk} \phi^i \phi^j \phi^k + h.c. \quad (79)$$

¹⁰In case of ordinary reduction of a 10-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SYM theory, one obtains an $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM Yang-Mills theory in four dimensions having a global $SU(4)_R$ symmetry which is identified with the tangent space $SO(6)$ of the extra dimensions [14, 15].

¹¹The SSB terms that will be inserted into $V_{\mathcal{N}=1}^{proj}(\phi)$, are purely scalar. Although this is enough for our purpose, it is obvious that more SSB terms have to be included too, in order to obtain the full SSB sector [62].

are introduced, where $h_{ijk} = 0$ unless $i + j + k \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$. The introduction of these SSB terms should not come as a surprise, since the presence of an SSB sector is necessary anyway for a model with realistic aspirations, see e.g. [62]. The inclusion of the D -terms of the theory is necessary and they are given by

$$V_D = \frac{1}{2}D^2 = \frac{1}{2}D^I D_I, \quad (80)$$

where $D^I = \phi_i^\dagger T^I \phi^i$, where T^I are the generators in the representation of the corresponding chiral multiplets.

So, the total potential of the theory is given by

$$V = V_{N=1}^{proj} + V_{SSB} + V_D. \quad (81)$$

A suitable choice for the parameters m_i^2 and h_{ijk} in (79) is $m_i^2 = 1$, $h_{ijk} = \epsilon_{ijk}$. Therefore, the total scalar potential, (81), takes the form

$$V = \frac{1}{4}(F^{ij})^\dagger F^{ij} + V_D, \quad (82)$$

where F^{ij} is defined as

$$F^{ij} = [\phi^i, \phi^j] - i\epsilon^{ijk}(\phi^k)^\dagger. \quad (83)$$

The first term of the scalar potential, (82), is always positive, therefore, the global minimum of the potential is obtained when

$$[\phi^i, \phi^j] = i\epsilon_{ijk}(\phi^k)^\dagger, \quad \phi^i(\phi^j)^\dagger = R^2, \quad (84)$$

where $(\phi^i)^\dagger$ denotes the hermitian conjugate of ϕ^i and $[R^2, \phi^i] = 0$. It is clear that the above equations are related to a fuzzy sphere. This becomes more transparent by considering the untwisted fields $\tilde{\phi}^i$, defined by

$$\phi^i = \Omega \tilde{\phi}^i, \quad (85)$$

where $\Omega \neq 1$ satisfy the relations

$$\Omega^3 = 1, \quad [\Omega, \phi^i] = 0, \quad \Omega^\dagger = \Omega^{-1}, \quad (\tilde{\phi}^i)^\dagger = \tilde{\phi}^i \Leftrightarrow (\phi^i)^\dagger = \Omega \phi^i. \quad (86)$$

Therefore, (84) reproduces the ordinary fuzzy sphere relations generated by $\tilde{\phi}^i$

$$[\tilde{\phi}^i, \tilde{\phi}^j] = i\epsilon_{ijk}\tilde{\phi}^k, \quad \tilde{\phi}^i\tilde{\phi}^i = R^2, \quad (87)$$

exhibiting the reason why the non-commutative space generated by ϕ^i is a twisted fuzzy sphere, $\tilde{S}_N^2$.

Next, one can find configurations of the twisted fields ϕ^i , i.e. fields satisfying (84). Such configuration is

$$\phi^i = \Omega(\mathbf{1}_3 \otimes \lambda_{(N)}^i), \quad (88)$$

where $\lambda_{(N)}^i$ are the $SU(2)$ generators in the N -dimensional irreducible representation and Ω is the matrix

$$\Omega = \Omega_3 \otimes \mathbf{1}_N, \quad \Omega_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Omega^3 = \mathbf{1}. \quad (89)$$

According to the transformation (85), the "off-diagonal" orbifold sectors (75) convert to the block-diagonal form

$$\phi^i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\lambda_{(N)}^i)_{(N, \bar{N}, 1)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (\lambda_{(N)}^i)_{(1, N, \bar{N})} \\ (\lambda_{(N)}^i)_{(\bar{N}, 1, N)} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \Omega \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{(N)}^i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_{(N)}^i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_{(N)}^i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (90)$$

Therefore, the untwisted fields generating the ordinary fuzzy sphere, $\tilde{\phi}^i$, are written in a block-diagonal form. Each block can be considered as an ordinary fuzzy sphere, since they separately satisfy the corresponding commutation relations (87). In turn, the above configuration in (90), which corresponds to the vacuum of the theory, has the form of three fuzzy spheres, appearing with relative angles $2\pi/3$. Concluding, the solution ϕ^i can be considered as the twisted equivalent of three fuzzy spheres, conforming with the orbifolding.

Note that the F^{ij} defined in (83), can be interpreted as the field strength of the spontaneously generated fuzzy extra dimensions. The second term of the potential, V_D , induces a change on the radius of the sphere (in a similar way to the case of the ordinary fuzzy sphere [33, 35, 63]).

6.3 Chiral models after the fuzzy orbifold projection - The $SU(3)_c \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$ model

The resulting unification groups after the orbifold projection are various because of the different ways the gauge group $SU(3N)$ is spontaneously broken. The minimal, anomaly free models are $SU(4) \times SU(2) \times SU(2)$, $SU(4)^3$ and $SU(3)^{312}$.

We focus on the breaking of the latter, which is the trinification group $SU(3)_c \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$ [64, 65] (see also [45, 66–69] and for a string theory approach see [70]). At first, the integer N has to be decomposed as $N = n + 3$. Then, for $SU(N)$, the considered embedding is

$$SU(N) \supset SU(n) \times SU(3) \times U(1), \quad (91)$$

from which it follows that the embedding for the gauge group $SU(N)^3$ is

$$SU(N)^3 \supset SU(n) \times SU(3) \times SU(n) \times SU(3) \times SU(n) \times SU(3) \times U(1)^3. \quad (92)$$

The three $U(1)$ factors are ignored¹³ and the representations are decomposed according to (92), (after reordering the factors) as

$$\begin{aligned} & SU(n) \times SU(n) \times SU(n) \times SU(3) \times SU(3) \times SU(3), \\ & (n, \bar{n}, 1; 1, 1, 1) + (1, n, \bar{n}; 1, 1, 1) + (\bar{n}, 1, n; 1, 1, 1) + (1, 1, 1; 3, \bar{3}, 1) \\ & + (1, 1, 1; 1, 3, \bar{3}) + (1, 1, 1; \bar{3}, 1, 3) + (n, 1, 1; 1, \bar{3}, 1) + (1, n, 1; 1, 1, \bar{3}) \\ & + (1, 1, n; \bar{3}, 1, 1) + (\bar{n}, 1, 1; 1, 1, 3) + (1, \bar{n}, 1; 3, 1, 1) + (1, 1, \bar{n}; 1, 3, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Taking into account the decomposition (91), the gauge group is broken to $SU(3)^3$. Now, under $SU(3)^3$, the surviving fields transform as

$$SU(3) \times SU(3) \times SU(3), \quad (94)$$

$$((3, \bar{3}, 1) + (\bar{3}, 1, 3) + (1, 3, \bar{3})), \quad (95)$$

which correspond to the desired chiral representations of the trinification group. Under $SU(3)_c \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$, the quarks and leptons of the first family transform as

$$q = \begin{pmatrix} d & u & h \\ d & u & h \\ d & u & h \end{pmatrix} \sim (3, \bar{3}, 1), q^c = \begin{pmatrix} d^c & d^c & d^c \\ u^c & u^c & u^c \\ h^c & h^c & h^c \end{pmatrix} \sim (\bar{3}, 1, 3), \lambda = \begin{pmatrix} N & E^c & \mathbf{v} \\ E & N^c & e \\ \mathbf{v}^c & e^c & S \end{pmatrix} \sim (1, 3, \bar{3}), \quad (96)$$

respectively. Similarly, one obtains the matrices for the fermions of the other two families.

It is worth noting that this theory can be upgraded to a two-loop finite theory (for reviews see [45, 73–75]) and give testable predictions [45], too. Additionally, fuzzy orbifolds can be used to break spontaneously the unification gauge group down to MSSM and then to the $SU(3)_c \times U(1)_{em}$.

Summarizing this section let us emphasize the general picture of the model that has been constructed. At very high-scale regime, we have an unbroken renormalizable theory. After the spontaneous symmetry breaking, the resulting gauge theory is accompanied by a finite tower of massive Kaluza-Klein modes. Finally, the theory breaks down to an extension of MSSM in the low scale regime. Therefore, we conclude that fuzzy extra dimensions can be used in constructing chiral, renormalizable and phenomenologically viable field-theoretical models.

A natural extension of the above ideas and methods have been reported in ref [76] (see also [77]), realized in the context of Matrix Models (MM). At a fundamental level, the MMs introduced by Banks-Fischler-Shenker-Susskind (BFSS) and Ishibashi-Kawai-Kitazawa-Tsuchiya (IKKT), are supposed to provide a non-perturbative definition of M-theory and type IIB string theory respectively [28, 78]. On the other hand, MMs are also useful laboratories for the study of structures which could be relevant from a low-energy point of view. Indeed, they

¹²Similar approaches have been studied in the framework of YM matrix models [71], lacking phenomenological viability.

¹³As anomalous gaining mass by the Green-Schwarz mechanism and therefore they decouple at the low energy sector of the theory [60].

generate a plethora of interesting solutions, corresponding to strings, D-branes and their interactions [28, 79], as well as to non-commutative/fuzzy spaces, such as fuzzy tori and spheres [80]. Such backgrounds naturally give rise to non-abelian gauge theories. Therefore, it appears natural to pose the question whether it is possible to construct phenomenologically interesting particle physics models in this framework as well. In addition, an orbifold MM was proposed by Aoki-Iso-Suyama (AIS) in [81] as a particular projection of the IKKT model, and it is directly related to the construction described above in which fuzzy extra dimensions arise with trinification gauge theory [36]. By $\mathbb{Z}_3$ - orbifolding, the original symmetry of the IKKT matrix model with matrix size $3N \times 3N$ is generally reduced from $SO(9, 1) \times U(3N)$ to $SO(3, 1) \times U(N)^3$. This model is chiral and has $D = 4$, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry of Yang-Mills type as well as an inhomogeneous supersymmetry specific to matrix models. The $\mathbb{Z}_3$ - invariant fermion fields transform as bifundamental representations under the unbroken gauge symmetry exactly as in the constructions described above. In the future we plan to extend further the studies initiated in refs [76, 77] in the context of orbifolded IKKT models.

Our current interest is to continue in two directions. Given that the two approaches discussed here led to the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ trinification GUT $SU(3)^3$, one plan is to examine the phenomenological consequences of these models. The models are different in the details but certainly there exist a certain common ground. Among others we plan to determine in both cases the spectrum of the Dirac and Laplace operators in the extra dimensions and use them to study the behaviour of the various couplings, including the contributions of the massive Kaluza-Klein modes. These contributions are infinite or finite in number, depending on whether the extra dimensions are continuous or fuzzy, respectively. We should note that the spectrum of the Dirac operator at least in the case of $SU(3)/U(1) \times U(1)$ is not known.

Another plan is to start with an abelian theory in ten dimensions and with a simple reduction to obtain an $\mathcal{N} = (1, 1)$ abelian theory in six dimensions. Finally, reducing the latter theory over a fuzzy sphere, possibly with Chern-Simons terms, to obtain a non-abelian gauge theory in four dimensions provided with soft supersymmetry breaking terms. Recall that the last feature was introduced by hand in the realistic models constructed in the fuzzy extra dimensions framework.

Acknowledgement

This research is supported by the Research Funding Program ARISTEIA, Higher Order Calculations and Tools for High Energy Colliders, HOCTools and the ARISTEIA II, Investigation of certain higher derivative term field theories and gravity models (co-financed by the European Union (European Social Fund ESF) and Greek national funds through the Operational Program Education and Lifelong Learning of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF)), by the European Union's ITN programme HIGGSTOOLS, as well as by the Action MP1405 QSPACE from the European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST). One of the authors, G.Z., would like to thank the organizers and ITP-Heidelberg for the warm and generous hospitality.

References

- [1] Green M.B., Schwarz J.H., Witten E., Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987; Green M.B., Schwarz J.H., Witten E., Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987; Polchinski J., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998; Polchinski J., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998; Blumenhagen R., Lüst D., Theisen S., Springer, 2013.
- [2] Gross D.J., Harvey J.A., Martinec E.J., Rohm R., Nuclear Phys. B256 (1985) 253; Gross D.J., Harvey J.A., Martinec E.J., Rohm R., Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 502.
- [3] Forgács P., Manton N.S., Comm. Math. Phys. 72 (1980) 15-35.
- [4] Kapetanakis D., Zoupanos G., Phys. Rep. 219 (1992).
- [5] Kubyshin Yu.A., Mourão J.M., Rudolph G., Volobujev I.P., Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 349, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

- [6] Scherk J., Schwarz J.H., Nuclear Phys. B153 (1979) 61-88.
- [7] Manton N.S., Nuclear Phys. B193 (1981) 502-516.
- [8] Chapline G., Slansky R., Nuclear Phys. B209 (1982) 461-483.
- [9] P. Candelas, G. T. Horowitz, A. Strominger, E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B258, (1985) 46
- [10] Cardoso G.L., Curio G., Dall'Agata G., Lust D., Manousselis P., Zoupanos G., Nucl. Phys. B 652 (2003) 5-34, hep-th/0211118; Strominger A., Nucl. Phys. B274 (1986) 253; Lüst D., Nucl.Phys. B276 (1986) 220; Castellani L., Lüst D., Nucl.Phys. B296 (1988) 143.
- [11] K. Becker, M. Becker, K. Dasgupta and P. S. Green, JHEP 0304 (2003) 007, hep-th/0301161; K. Becker, M. Becker, P. S. Green, K. Dasgupta and E. Sharpe, Nucl. Phys. B678 (2004) 19, hep-th/0310058; S. Gurrieri, A. Lukas and A. Micu, Phys. Rev. D70 (2004) 126009, hep-th/0408121; I. Benmachiche, J. Louis and D. Martinez-Pedrerá, Class. Quant. Grav. 25 (2008) 135006, arXiv:0802.0410 [hep-th];
A. Micu, Phys. Rev. D 70 (2004) 126002, hep-th/0409008;
A. R. Frey and M. Lippert, Phys. Rev. D 72 (2005) 126001, hep-th/0507202;
P. Manousselis, N. Prezas and G. Zoupanos, Nucl. Phys. B739 (2006) 85, hep-th/0511122; A. Chatzistavarakidis, P. Manousselis and G. Zoupanos, Fortsch. Phys. 57 (2009) 527, arXiv:0811.2182 [hep-th];
A. Chatzistavarakidis and G. Zoupanos, JHEP 0909 (2009) 077, arXiv:0905.2398 [hep-th];
B. P. Dolan and R. J. Szabo, JHEP 0908 (2009) 038, arXiv:0905.4899 [hep-th];
O. Lechtenfeld, C. Nolle and A. D. Popov, JHEP 1009 (2010) 074, arXiv:1007.0236 [hep-th];
A. D. Popov and R. J. Szabo, JHEP 202 (2012) 033, arXiv:1009.3208 [hep-th];
M. Klaput, A. Lukas and C. Matti, JHEP 1109 (2011) 100, arXiv:1107.3573 [hep-th];
A. Chatzistavarakidis, O. Lechtenfeld and A. D. Popov, JHEP 1204 (2012) 114, arXiv:1202.1278 [hep-th];
J. Gray, M. Larfors and D. Lüst, , JHEP 1208 (2012) 099, arXiv:1205.6208 [hep-th];
M. Klaput, A. Lukas, C. Matti and E. E. Svanes, JHEP 1301 (2013) 015, arXiv:1210.5933 [hep-th];
- [12] N. Irges and G. Zoupanos, Phys. Lett. B698, (2011) 146, arXiv:hep-ph/1102.2220; N. Irges, G. Orfanidis, G. Zoupanos, arXiv:1205.0753 [hep-ph], PoS CORFU2011 (2011) 105.
- [13] Butruille J. -B., arXiv:math.DG/0612655.
- [14] P. Manousselis, G. Zoupanos, Phys.Lett. B518 (2001) 171-180, hep-ph/0106033; P. Manousselis, G. Zoupanos, Phys.Lett. B504 (2001) 122-130
- [15] P. Manousselis, G. Zoupanos, JHEP 0411 (2004) 025, hep-ph/0406207; P. Manousselis, G. Zoupanos, JHEP 0203 (2002) 002.
- [16] Connes A., Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA, 1994.
- [17] Madore J., London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Vol. 257, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [18] Buric M., Grammatikopoulos T., Madore j., Zoupanos G., JHEP 0604 (2006) 054; Buric M., Madore j., Zoupanos G., SIGMA 3:125,2007, arXiv:0712.4024 [hep-th].
- [19] T. Filk, Phys. Lett. B 376 (1996) 53; J. C. Várilly and J. M. Gracia-Bondía, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 14 (1999) 1305 [hep-th/9804001]; M. Chaichian, A. Demichev and P. Presnajder, Nucl. Phys. B 567 (2000) 360, hep-th/9812180; S. Minwalla, M. Van Raamsdonk and N. Seiberg, JHEP 0002 (2000) 020, hep-th/9912072.
- [20] H. Grosse and R. Wulkenhaar, Lett. Math. Phys. 71 (2005) 13, hep-th/0403232.

- [21] H. Grosse and H. Steinacker, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 12 (2008) 605, hep-th/0607235; H. Grosse and H. Steinacker, Nucl. Phys. B 707 (2005) 145, hep-th/0407089.
- [22] Connes A., Lott J., Nuclear Phys. B Proc. Suppl. 18 (1991), 29-47; Chamseddine A.H., Connes A., Comm. Math. Phys. 186 (1997), 731-750, hep-th/9606001; Chamseddine A.H., Connes A., Phys. Rev. Lett. 99 (2007), 191601, arXiv:0706.3690.
- [23] Martín C.P., Gracia-Bondía M.J., Várilly J.C., Phys. Rep. 294 (1998), 363-406, hep-th/9605001.
- [24] Dubois-Violette M., Madore J., Kerner R., Phys. Lett. B217 (1989), 485-488; Dubois-Violette M., Madore J., Kerner R., Classical Quantum Gravity 6 (1989), 1709-1724; Dubois-Violette M., Kerner R., Madore J., J. Math. Phys. 31 (1990), 323-330.
- [25] Madore J., Phys. Lett. B 305 (1993), 84-89; Madore J., (Sobotka Castle, 1992), Fund. Theories Phys., Vol. 52, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1993, 285-298. hep-ph/9209226.
- [26] Connes A., Douglas M.R., Schwarz A., JHEP (1998), no.2, 003, hep-th/9711162.
- [27] Seiberg N., Witten E., JHEP (1999), no.9, 032, hep-th/9908142.
- [28] N.Ishibashi, H.Kawai, Y.Kitazawa and A.Tsuchiya, Nucl. Phys. B498 (1997) 467, arXiv:hep-th/9612115.
- [29] Jurčo B., Schraml S., Schupp P., Wess J., Eur. Phys. J. C 17 (2000), 521-526, hep-th/0006246; Jurčo B., Schupp P., Wess J., Nuclear Phys. B 604 (2001), 148-180, hep-th/0102129; Jurčo B., Moller L., Schraml S., Schupp S., Wess J., Eur. Phys. J. C 21 (2001), 383-388, hep-th/0104153; Barnich G., Brandt F., Grigoriev M., JHEP (2002), no.8, 023, hep-th/0206003.
- [30] Chaichian M., Prešnajder P., Sheikh-Jabbari M.M., Tureanu A., Eur. Phys. J. C 29 (2003), 413-432, hep-th/0107055.
- [31] Calmet X., Jurčo B., Schupp P., Wess J., Wohlgenannt M., Eur. Phys. J. C 23 (2002), 363-376, hep-ph/0111115; Aschieri P., Jurčo B., Schupp P., Wess J., Nuclear Phys. B 651 (2003), 45-70, hep-th/0205214; Behr W., Deshpande N.G., Duplancic G., Schupp P., Trampetic J., Wess J., Eur.Phys.J.C29: 441-446, 2003.
- [32] Aschieri P., Madore J., Manousselis P., Zoupanos G., JHEP (2004), no. 4, 034, hep-th/0310072; Aschieri P., Madore J., Manousselis P., Zoupanos G., Fortsch. Phys. 52 (2004), 718-723, hep-th/0401200; Aschieri P., Madore J., Manousselis P., Zoupanos G., Conference: C04-08-20.1 (2005) 135-146, hep-th/0503039.
- [33] Aschieri P., Grammatikopoulos T., Steinacker H., Zoupanos G., JHEP (2006), no. 9, 026, hep-th/0606021; Aschieri P., Steinacker H., Madore J., Manousselis P., Zoupanos G., arXiv:0704.2880.
- [34] Steinacker H., Zoupanos G., JHEP (2007), no. 9, 017, arXiv:0706.0398.
- [35] A. Chatzistavrakidis, H. Steinacker and G. Zoupanos, Fortsch.Phys. 58 (2010) 537-552, arXiv:0909.5559 [hep-th].
- [36] A. Chatzistavrakidis, H. Steinacker and G. Zoupanos, JHEP 1005 (2010) 100, arXiv:hep-th/1002.2606 A. Chatzistavrakidis and G. Zoupanos, SIGMA 6 (2010) 063, arXiv:hep-th/1008.2049.
- [37] Andrews, R.P. et al. Nucl.Phys. B751 (2006) 304-341 hep-th/0601098 SWAT-06-455
- [38] D. Lüst and G. Zoupanos, Phys. Lett. B165 (1985) 309;
G. Douzas, T. Grammatikopoulos and G. Zoupanos, Eur. Phys. J. C59 (2009) 917
- [39] D. Kapetanakis and G. Zoupanos, Phys. Lett. B249, 73(1990); *ibid.*, Z. Phys. C56, 91 (1992).
- [40] Madore J., Classical Quantum Gravity 9 (1992), 69-87.

- [41] C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B222, 20 (1983); L. Palla, Z.Phys. C 24, 195 (1984); K. Pilch and A. N. Schellekens, J. Math. Phys. 25, 3455(1984); P. Forgacs, Z. Horvath and L. Palla, Z. Phys. C30, 261(1986); K. J. Barnes, P. Forgacs, M. Surridge and G. Zoupanos, Z. Phys. C33, 427(1987).
- [42] G. Chapline and N. S. Manton, Nucl. Phys. B184, 391(1981); F.A.Bais, K. J. Barnes, P. Forgacs and G. Zoupanos, Nucl. Phys. B263, 557(1986); Y. A. Kubyshin, J. M. Mourao, I. P. Volobujev, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 4, 151(1989).
- [43] J. Harnad, S. Shnider and L. Vinet, J. Math. Phys. 20, 931(1979); 21, 2719(1980); J. Harnad, S. Shnider and J. Tafel, Lett. Math. Phys. 4, 107(1980).
- [44] K. Farakos, G. Koutsoumbas, M. Surridge and G. Zoupanos, Nucl. Phys. B291, 128(1987); *ibid.*, Phys. Lett. B191, 135(1987).
- [45] E. Ma, M. Mondragon and G. Zoupanos, JHEP 0412 (2004) 026; S. Heinemeyer, E. Ma, M. Mondragon and G. Zoupanos, AIP Conf. Proc. 1200 (2010) 568, arXiv:0910.0501 [hep-ph].
- [46] Madore J., Schraml S., Schupp P., Wess J., Eur. Phys. J. C 16 (2000) 161-167, hep-th/0001203.
- [47] Harland D., Kurkçuoğlu S., Nucl. Phys. B 821 (2009), 380-398, arXiv:0905.2338.
- [48] Kachru S., Silverstein E., Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998), 4855-4858, hep-th/9802183.
- [49] Candelas P., Horowitz G.T., Strominger A., Witten E., Nuclear Phys. B 258 (1985), 46-74.
- [50] Gauntlett J.P., Martelli D., Waldram D., Phys. Rev. D 69 (2004), 086002, hep-th/0302158.
- [51] Maldacena J.M., Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2 (1998), 231-252, hep-th/9711200; Maldacena J.M., Internat. J. Theoret. Phys. 38 (1999), 1113-1133.
- [52] Douglas M.R., Moore G.W., hep-th/9603167.
- [53] Douglas M.R., Greene B.R., Morrison D.R., Nuclear Phys. B 506 (1997), 84-106, hep-th/9704151.
- [54] N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen and H. Georgi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 (2001) 4757, hep-th/0104005; Phys. Lett. B 513 (2001) 232, arXiv:hep-ph/0105239.
- [55] Steinacker H., Nuclear Phys. B 679 (2004), 66-98, hep-th/0307075.
- [56] Bailin D., Love A., Phys. Rep. 315 (1999), 285-408.
- [57] Dixon L.J., Harvey J.A., Vafa C., Witten E., Nuclear Phys. B 261 (1985), 678-686; Dixon L.J., Harvey J.A., Vafa C., Witten E., Nucl. Phys. B 274 (1986), 285-314.
- [58] Brink L., Schwarz J.H., Scherk J., Nucl. Phys. B 121 (1977), 77-92; Gliozzi F., Scherk J., Olive D.I., Nucl. Phys. B 122 (1977), 253-290.
- [59] Aldazabal G., Ibáñez L.E., Quevedo F., Uranga A.M., JHEP (2000), no. 8, 002, hep-th/0005067.
- [60] Lawrence A.E., Nekrasov N., Vafa C., Nuclear Phys. B 533 (1998), 199-209, hep-th/9803015.
- [61] Kiritsis E., Phys. Rep. 421 (2005), 105-190, Erratum, Phys. Rep. 429 (2006), 121-122, hep-th/0310001.
- [62] Djouadi A., Phys. Rep. 459 (2008), 1-241, hep-ph/0503173.
- [63] Steinacker H., Springer Proceedings in Physics, Vol. 98, Springer, Berlin, 2005, 307-311, hep-th/0409235.
- [64] Glashow S.L., Published in Providence Grand Unif. 1984:0088, 88-94.
- [65] Rizov V.A., Bulg. J. Phys. 8 (1981), 461-477.

- [66] Ma E., Mondragón M., Zoupanos G., JHEP (2004), no. 12, 026, hep-ph/0407236.
- [67] Lazarides G., Panagiotakopoulos C., Phys. Lett. B 336 (1994), 190-193, hep-ph/9403317.
- [68] Babu K.S., He X.G., Pakvasa S., Phys. Rev. D 33 (1986), 763-772.
- [69] Leontaris G.K., Rizos J., Phys. Lett. B 632 (2006), 710-716, hep-ph/0510230.
- [70] Kim J.E., Phys. Lett. B 564 (2003), 35-41, hep-th/0301177; Choi K.S., Kim J.E., Phys. Lett. B 567 (2003), 87-92, hep-ph/0305002.
- [71] H. Grosse, F. Lizzi and H. Steinacker, Phys.Rev. D81 (2010) 085034 , arXiv:1001.2703 [hep-th]; H. Steinacker, Nucl. Phys. B 810 (2009) 1, arXiv:0806.2032 [hep-th].
- [72] J. Maalampi and M. Roos, Phys. Rept. 186 (1990) 53.
- [73] S. Heinemeyer, M. Mondragon and G. Zoupanos, Int.J.Mod.Phys. A29 (2014) 18, hep-ph/1430032.
- [74] M. Mondragon, N. Tracas and G. Zoupanos, arXiv:1403.7384 [hep-ph].
- [75] S. Heinemeyer, M. Mondragon and G. Zoupanos, SIGMA 6 (2010) 049, arXiv:1001.0428 [hep-ph].
- [76] A. Chatzistavrakidis, H. Steinacker, , G. Zoupanos, PoS CORFU2011, PoC: C11-09-04.1, arXiv:1204.6498 [hep-th].
- [77] A. Chatzistavrakidis, H. Steinacker, G. Zoupanos, JHEP 1109 (2011) 115, arXiv:1107.0265 [hep-th]
- [78] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 5112, hep-th/9610043.
- [79] I. Chepelev, Y. Makeenko and K. Zarembo, Phys. Lett. B 400 (1997) 43 [hep-th/9701151]; A. Fayyazuddin and D. J. Smith, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 12 (1997) 1447, hep-th/9701168; H. Aoki, N. Ishibashi, S. Iso, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa and T. Tada, Nucl. Phys. B 565 (2000) 176, hep-th/9908141.
- [80] S. Iso, Y. Kimura, K. Tanaka and K. Wakatsuki, Nucl. Phys. B 604 (2001) 121, hep-th/0101102; Y. Kimura, Prog. Theor. Phys. 106 (2001) 445, hep-th/0103192; Y. Kitazawa, Nucl. Phys. B 642 (2002) 210, hep-th/0207115.
- [81] H. Aoki, S. Iso and T. Suyama, Nucl. Phys. B 634 (2002) 71, arXiv:hep-th/0203277.